

ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the leader, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess under the previous order following the remarks by Senator DASCHLE and my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

OPERATIONAL SUPPORT AIRLIFT AIRCRAFT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I would like to take about 5 minutes or less to discuss an item that I will be bringing up on the defense authorization bill. I have what you might consider a very minor amendment but one that gets at the basic issues that I have been trying to present to my colleagues on mismanagement in the Department of Defense.

My amendment deals with the fleet of executive aircraft and the VIP helicopters. Most of these airplanes are known as the operational support airlift aircraft.

I want my colleagues to know that this amendment comes from studying positions taken by people within the Defense Department or outside the Congress of the United States. So my amendment does not come from an idea that I dreamed up.

My position rests on sound ground because I think it is a studied position made by a lot of people that we in this Congress ought to respect. It is based on two very recent reports: a Department of Defense IG report dated June 1995; a GAO report also dated June 1995. But that is not all. My thinking on this issue is based upon a mountain of Department of Defense studies. And these all point in one direction, that we should cut the number of planes in this operational support airlift fleet.

I would just like to tell my colleagues where I am trying to go with this amendment. During the upcoming debate that will happen later on this week on the Defense authorization bill, I am going to talk about a long string of Department of Defense reports and recommendations to cut the OSA fleet.

In February 1993, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Colin Powell, recommended a reduction of this fleet of aircraft. In September 1994, the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, General McPeak, recommended a reduction in this fleet of aircraft. In May of 1995, the Department of Defense Commission on Roles and Missions recommended a reduction in the OSA fleet of aircraft.

The Department of Defense Commission on Roles and Missions was chaired by Mr. John P. White. Mr. White recommended reductions in the OSA fleet just before becoming Deputy Secretary of Defense.

Mr. President, this issue has been studied to death, not by CHUCK GRASSLEY's own research, but by my merely

reading report recommendations made by people within the Department of Defense by people at the General Accounting Office, people that we ought to have some respect for.

So how many studies does it take to cut a Pentagon program? The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, and now the Deputy Secretary of Defense have all recommended cuts in this fleet of VIP aircraft. I think that most Members of this body would respect the judgment of people like Colin Powell, General McPeak, and Deputy Secretary of Defense White. When they say that this ought to be done, then it seems to me we ought to do it.

It kind of bothers me that these recommendations, once they are made, just do not happen. Why do we have to do it in the Congress? Why do I have to bring it to the attention of my colleagues to make it happen? When I got done reading the May 1995 roles and missions report, I decided to write a letter to Mr. White. My letter to Mr. White is dated July 12, 1995. I hoped Mr. White might be willing to help me develop a plan to downsize this fleet of aircraft. I want to know if he would be willing to work with me in developing a plan to carry out his own recommendations.

Mr. White's reply to my letter is dated July 31, 1995. I ask unanimous consent to print this correspondence in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, DC, July 12, 1995.

Hon. JOHN P. WHITE,
Deputy Secretary of Defense, Pentagon, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am writing to you about the need to reduce the Department of Defense's (DOD) fleet of Operational Support Airlift (OSA) aircraft.

The DOD Inspector General and General Accounting Office (GAO) have just concluded independent reviews of how these aircraft are used and how much these operations cost the taxpayers. Copies of those reports are attached for your consideration. Both clearly indicate that many of these flights are wasteful and unnecessary.

The GAO found, for example, that the Andrews AFB, Maryland to Wright-Patterson AFB near Dayton, Ohio is the heaviest traveled OSA route. Both locations are readily served by commercial airlines offering LOW government contract airfares. Continental and United Airlines have 5 to 6 flights each way between Washington and Dayton every workday. The one-way airfare on Continental is \$98.00. The cost to move comparable numbers of passengers from Andrews to Wright-Patterson on an OSA C-21 aircraft is at least 3 to 4 times higher than on Continental Airlines—if all appropriate expenses are included.

There is no way to justify the use of military aircraft for routine travel between destinations like Washington, D.C. and Dayton, Ohio. Unfortunately, the bulk of OSA flights are between cities like Washington and Dayton—cities connected by convenient and efficient commercial airline service. In most cases, this service is provided by government contract carriers at discount prices.

Mr. White, I bring this particular issue to your attention for one simple reason. As the Chairman of the most recent "Commission on Roles and Missions of the Armed Forces," you concluded that "there are too many OSA aircraft . . . and recommended changes to eliminate excess capacity and save money." Your findings and recommendations—as presented in the May 1995 report—are fully consistent with a long list of similar DOD studies. All agree on one point: Inventories of OSA aircraft exceed wartime requirements. Reductions are now in order.

Well, Mr. Secretary, shortly after recommending cuts in the OSA fleet, you became the Deputy Secretary of Defense. So this is where "the rubber meets the road." It's time to make the cuts that you recommended. I have developed my own plan for "eliminating excess capacity and saving money." A copy of my plan is attached for your review. It would reduce the OSA fleet by 50 percent by the end of fiscal year 1997 and would save about \$550 million annually, according to the Congressional Budget Office.

I would be the first to admit that it is very difficult for Congress to successfully legislate a solution to a problem like this—without the cooperation of the department involved. I would much prefer to work with you in developing a more acceptable solution. With that in mind, would you please review my plan and make any suggestions you consider appropriate. I would like to be in a position to offer a proposal when the defense authorization and appropriations bills are brought to the Senate floor for debate.

Your cooperation in this matter would be appreciated.

Sincerely,

CHARLES E. GRASSLEY,
U.S. Senator.

DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, DC, July 31, 1995.

Hon. CHARLES E. GRASSLEY,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR GRASSLEY, This is in response to your letter of July 12, 1995, concerning your proposed amendment to the Defense Authorization Bill for Fiscal Year 1996 to reduce the Department of Defense's Operational Support Airlift (OSA) aircraft fleet.

As a result of the Commission on Roles and Missions recommendation, the Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff is conducting a study to validate the size of the OSA fleet needed in wartime, based on supporting two major regional conflicts (MRCs) which occur nearly simultaneously. During this study, slated for completion this fall, the Joint Staff will evaluate Service and Theater CINC-stated requirements to avoid unnecessary duplication or overlapping requirements. At the same time, we are implementing a plan under which the Transportation Command will closely monitor the peacetime scheduling and patterns of use of these aircraft.

On the basis of these efforts, we will determine the most effective and efficient organizational structure to schedule, maintain, and operate the fixed-wing OSA fleet based upon a combination of wartime effectiveness and peacetime efficiency. Until I see the results of these analyses, it would be premature for me to endorse a legislative approach.

Sincerely,

JOHN P. WHITE.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, quite frankly, Mr. White's letter to me is a disappointment. Mr. White says that the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff "is conducting a study to validate the size of the OSA fleet in wartime." Now the committee has signed off on this approach. Another study is

a delaying tactic. I think that is all it is, quite frankly.

I said a moment ago our OSA fleet has been studied to death. As chairman of the Department of Defense Commission on Roles and Missions, Mr. White concluded that the fleet of airplanes was too big and that it should be cut down to size. Well, this is where the rubber meets the road. Mr. White is the top dog over in the Pentagon now. He occupies a very top position. Mr. White is now in a position to give some direction and guidance, and his recommendations in the roles and missions report tells me that he already knows what that direction should be.

So what is he waiting for? The time has come to stop studying the issue. More study is a waste of time and, most important, a waste of money. The Department of Defense, under Mr. White's direction, should develop a plan to downsize this fleet of aircraft. How many of these airplanes are really needed? How should the fleet be managed? How should the Department dispose of the unneeded airplanes? Those are the questions that must be addressed.

I do not see my amendment as the magic solution, by the way. My amendment was merely a starting point. I am not convinced that my proposed number, whatever I might pick, whether it be 20 percent, 30 percent, 40 percent, or 50 percent, might be the right number. But I do not think we can settle for ignoring the recommendations of Colin Powell, the recommendations of General McPeak, the recommendations of the roles and missions report under Mr. White's directive. I do not believe we can ignore the General Accounting Office that there are more airplanes than are needed. Only 9 percent of these planes were used in the Persian Gulf war. It is time to downsize the fleet. I think that we ought to take a first step this year during the debate on the defense authorization bill to make a downpayment on the recommendations that have been made by Colin Powell, General McPeak, and by Mr. John White. I want to see us start down the road in that direction, the direction proposed by the Deputy Secretary of Defense, White, and I want that first step to be meaningful and to be significant.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FAMILY SELF-SUFFICIENCY ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, few debates have had greater importance

than the one we have begun this week. A number of us have been working now for many months in preparation for this debate. I want to thank Members on both sides of the aisle for the work that has been done thus far, and let me in particular commend the ranking member of the Finance Committee, Senator MOYNIHAN, for his leadership and the continued effort he has made to bring us to this point.

I also feel the need to, again, reiterate my gratitude to Senators BREAUX and MIKULSKI for the leadership they have given our caucus on the issue of welfare reform; Senators DODD and KENNEDY for all of the help they have given us with regard to the need to consider children as we deal with this issue; and Senators MOSELEY-BRAUN and CONRAD on the Finance Committee for their efforts.

Let me also cite the tremendous cooperation and support that we have been given from the administration, Democratic Governors, and local officials. For many months now, all of them, and many more within our caucus, have come forth to give us their best ideas and to produce what we hope will be one of the best work products that we have had since this Congress has begun.

Mr. President, the result of that effort has been a remarkable degree of unity within our caucus about the need for welfare reform and about the way we bring it about. We support a new concept which we call Work First, a concept which incorporates many very critical principles that we as Democrats feel strongly about, that we as Democrats can unite on and reach out to our Republican colleagues and hope that, working together, we can achieve meaningful welfare reform on a bipartisan basis this year.

First and foremost, as we consider those principles, Mr. President, our belief is that the emphasis needs to be put on work; that we end welfare as we know it; that we abolish the old infrastructure; that we create the incentives and the opportunities that must be created if, indeed, we are going to put work first.

So we begin by requiring that all able-bodied people go to work, get jobs, obtain the skills, do what is necessary to ensure that they break their dependency on welfare. We recognize that in order to do that, we have to provide tools that do not exist today. So as we abolish the AFDC Program and the old JOBS Program, we recognize that new tools must be put in place if indeed we are going to give people opportunities and the real hope that they can break that cycle of dependency, that they can go out with confidence and get the jobs that they need to get.

We also recognize that even though it may not be a part of welfare reform, it is very difficult to tell anybody today that they are to go out and get a minimum-wage job, work 40 hours a week, 52 weeks a year, and still be below the national poverty level. That is unacceptable.

If we are going to make work pay, we have to provide not only the economic incentives, but the opportunities and the confidence necessary so that indeed we can break the cycle of poverty, as well as the cycle of dependency. Breaking the cycle of poverty, hopefully this year, will mean an increase in the minimum wage, to ensure that men and women can work 40 hours or more a week and not be condemned to poverty in spite of their best efforts.

The second principle, Mr. President, is a recognition that there are impediments to ending welfare as we know it and to getting those jobs that exist today. We must address those impediments if indeed we are going to get the job done. Our belief is that the two most critical impediments are the fear of losing their health insurance and the lack of adequate child care.

First, they fear that once they get a job, especially if it is a minimum-wage job, they will lose their health insurance, they will have no protection for themselves or their children, because Medicaid will no longer be provided.

They also know that they have a Hobson's choice of getting a job or staying on welfare and taking care of their children. They do not want to be in a position of saying, I want to get that job, I want to go out into the private sector and obtain a good, meaningful, good-paying job—but I do not want to leave my children at home unattended. What am I going to do with my kids? How many families would be willing to leave their young children at home while they went out to get a minimum-wage job, which is, in part, what we are asking people to do today. That, too, is unacceptable. We cannot ask a young parent to do that. We have to find a way to ensure that their legitimate concerns are addressed in terms of health care, as well as in terms of child care.

So what we do in our Work First plan is extend Medicaid for another year to give people the opportunity to create the financial means to buy their health insurance. We do the same thing with child care. We tell them, look, we are going to care for your children, we are going to find a way, working with the States, to create the infrastructure necessary to see that your children are cared for. We are not going to effectively force you to leave them at home. We are not going to make you leave them unattended. We recognize how many problems are created at home when there is no adult supervision. That is the second principle—recognizing the impediments to work today and dealing with them.

The third principle is to ensure the safety net for children continues. Children should not be required to pay for the problems created by their parents. If we are going to break the cycle of dependency, it ought to be the goal of every Senator to strengthen the child, to give them the care, the direction, the nutrition, the protection that they need so that they never find themselves on welfare in the first place. Creating that mechanism of ensuring that children are protected has to be a fundamental principle of welfare reform, regardless of what else we do with their parents looking for work.

A fourth principle is to recognize today that we actually penalize husbands for staying at home and staying